



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/644,901	08/21/2003	Seung-Chul Park	1293.1959	6424

21171 7590 03/23/2006

STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

NEGRON, DANIEL L

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2627

DATE MAILED: 03/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/644,901

Applicant(s)

PARK ET AL.

Examiner

Daniell L. Negrón

Art Unit

2651

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 December 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11, 13, 16, 20-23, 25, 26 and 28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11, 13, 16, 20-23, 25, 26 and 28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on October 21, 2005 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement has been considered by the examiner.
2. Item "AE" of the IDS submitted on October 21, 2005 was not considered since it is a Japanese language document and no English equivalent or translation was provided.

Allowable Subject Matter

3. The indicated allowability of claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 7-10, 13, 20-22, 25, and 28 is withdrawn in view of the newly discovered references to Sacks et al U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0197968 and Serrano et al U.S. Patent No. 6,181,500. Rejections based on the newly cited references follow.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claims 2, 3, 5-7, 10, 11, 12, 16, 20-23, 26, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claims contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Examiner has not found any support for the term "track-defect-processing" in the

Art Unit: 2651

specification of the current application which designates the part or parts (i.e., steps) to which the term applies.

Examiner interprets "track-defect-processing" as reading data in order to detect a defect.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-11, 13, 16, 20-23, 25, 26, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sacks et al U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0197968 in view of Serrano et al U.S. Patent No. 6,181,500.

Regarding claims 1-3, Sacks et al disclose a method to write servo information on a disc in a disc drive comprising centering on a cylinder of the disc having skew '0', sequentially writing servo information toward the cylinder having skew '0' from an outer surface in an outer region (i.e., diameter), and sequentially writing the servo information toward the cylinder having skew '0' from an inner surface in an inner region (page 2, paragraph 27, lines 1-13, and page 3, paragraph 30, lines 19-25). Sacks et al however, fails to show a method wherein after writing the servo information is completed, inspecting the servo information written in a cylinder at a predetermined distance from the cylinder having skew '0', and determining whether the servo information is correctly written and if errors occur, determining that all the servo information is not correctly written, and writing the servo information again. It is considered that the cylinder

where '0' skew occurs is located in the MD zone, which is between a positive skew zone (i.e., OD) and a negative skew zone (i.e., ID).

However, Serrano et al disclose a method of track-defect-processing servo information on a disc. When defects are found in the servo information at a predetermined position, defective servo information is rewritten for the purpose of eliminating servo information that may contain errors (column 7, lines 32-60).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method of writing servo information disclosed by Sacks et al with the disclosure of servo information inspection of Serrano et al in order to check for erroneously written servo information and to correct such information therefore avoiding errors during head positioning.

Regarding claims 4-6, claims 4-6 have limitations similar to those treated in the above rejection of claims 1-3, and are met by the references as discussed above.

Regarding claims 7-10, 16, 20, 21, and 22, claims 7-10, 16, 20, 21, and 22 have limitations similar to those treated in the above rejection of claims 1 and 3, and are met by the references as discussed above.

Regarding claims 11, 13, 23, 25, 26, and 28, apparatus claims 11, 13, 23, 25, 26, and 28 are drawn to the apparatus corresponding to the method of using same as claimed in claims 1-3. Therefore apparatus claims 11, 13, 23, 25, 26, and 28 correspond to method claims 1-3, and are rejected for the same reasons of obviousness as used above.

Response to Arguments

Art Unit: 2651


8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-11, 13, 16, 20-23, 25, 26, and 28 have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniell L. Negrón whose telephone number is 571-272-7559. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:30am-5:00pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wayne R. Young can be reached on 571-272-7582. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DLN 
March 14, 2006


WAYNE YOUNG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER